



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS.

CONDUCTED BY J. D. FORREST, A. T. FREEMAN, AND H. A. MILLIS.

Social Christianity : Its Method.—Christianity ought to realize itself in the form of social institutions. Private initiative is preferable to state intervention as a means to this realization. All reforms implying a remodeling of legal codes are in the domain of the state. But the state cannot reconstruct society on a new basis and put it in harmony with the gospel. *Social* reforms are not only powerless to elevate the soul of a people, but may even be dangerous. Institutions and laws are merely inert instruments, capable of serving a bad as well as a good purpose. They need not be perfect, but they should be adapted to use. State socialism presupposes faultless officials. But even well applied it can attain only its economic ends. It cannot banish vice because the constraint of law is its only means, and liberty is an essential condition of true morality. The right of charity in educating the ignorant, in encouraging useful work for the material and moral good of the nation, cannot be denied to the government. But alms degrade, especially state alms. The personal element must be added in charity. A change of laws modifies men, and a change in men must be followed by a change in morals. Neither absolute individualism nor state socialism, as methods, take account of all the facts. The true method of moral action is social individualism, recognizing the reciprocal relation of men and morals.—L. RANDON, in *Revue du Christianisme Social*, November 1896. Fr.

The Principle of Social Christianity.—Hitherto the church has seemed to be ignorant that man is not entirely free, that he is a creature of habits formed by society and his surroundings. Christianity has tried to found the kingdom of God on earth by converting individuals. It gains thus units, for which the world ever disputes, and which death finally snatches away. With each generation the work must be begun over, a labor of Sisyphus. To bring humanity to that moral height which Christ called the kingdom of heaven it is necessary to suppress the mass of evil influences which press us on all sides and which almost inevitably drag us upon the downward path of sin. Christianity must declare war on prejudices and corrupt practices, must destroy the numberless iniquities at the base of our political and economic institutions, must, in short, prepare social surroundings favorable to the gospel. The church has too long held a false and mediæval conception of life as an evil to be endured. It is of no use to sulk over the life God has prepared for us on earth. Instead of avoiding contact with material things, Christians should grasp them and bring them into subjection. It is not enough to preach to men justice and charity. Justice and charity must be brought to men to win them. The church, for its own sake and for the world's salvation, should hasten to organize social Christianity. French protestantism looks with suspicion upon this movement. Some fear innovations on doctrine, whereas the movement calls only for new methods of practice. Others fancy that the care of souls will be neglected for the care of bodies. But Jesus showed profound solicitude for the poor and sick, and it is not new for Christians to found asylums, hospitals, etc. Besides, social Christianity regards the care of bodies as a means to an end—but the only efficacious means. A stronger reason for the distrust and aversion felt in France is due to the epithet "social" and a confusion of social Christianity with socialism. The two resemble each other in some external features, but not in spirit. Social Christianity does not hope to establish the kingdom of God by force, by violent attacks on the rich, by a war of classes, by contempt for the family and for religion. It appeals not to hate, but to love.—*Revue du Christianisme Social*, September 1896. Fr.

Liberty.—Happiness is not positive, but negative, consisting, not in an ever increasing number of pleasures, but in avoiding pain in the development of the faculties. In giving to his forces the direction of least resistance man allows his efforts to attain the maximum of productivity. This natural tendency explains the energy with which the love of liberty is manifested. The free development of the individual is the essential condition of his normal constitution and the expansion of his activity in respect to individual and race conservation, for it permits the individual to make use of his faculties and to adapt himself to external conditions. The necessities of social life demand that individual activity be submitted to certain rules, that the liberty of one may not infringe on that of others. Even authority established for this purpose is from the absolute point of view an evil, for it renders possible by the abuse of force the subduing of individual to individual, and even the absorbing of individuality in slavery. But it is an evil indispensable because of its services to society. The conclusion must be that regulation by authority of the conduct of individuals should exist only in cases of absolute necessity, recognized as such by science and the *élite* spirits of the time. Science teaches that the infringements of authority on the liberty of individuals ought in reason to be inverse to the degree of civilization of the time—the empire of men over themselves and nature. Thus this domain of authority has diminished in the course of history from primitive societies to modern American democracy. The principal difficulty encountered in trying to determine practically the functions of the state at a given moment consists in understanding the condition of culture of the people, and in fixing the degree of public guardianship indispensable for the time. This depends entirely on the average culture, intellectual and moral, of individuals. Two conclusions reached: first, that the government should be confided to those who, by their scientific and moral culture give the greatest guarantee of wisdom; second, that in what concerns complicated social phenomena the more rare and limited the intervention of authority, the smaller will be the chance of error, for its limitation gives free play to the laws of nature.—LADISLAS DOMANSKI, *Journal des Économistes*, November 1896. Fr.

Those "Without God" and the Social Question.—The economic and social problems are more or less direct consequences of the religious problem. The great and deplorable social uneasiness has for its fundamental cause life without God. Those "without God" are numerous. I. Contemporary. Atheism presents the following general characteristics: (1) Actual atheism is essentially variable and multi-form, being founded on a negative principle. (2) Contemporary atheism presents itself as scientific. Its popularity rests on the exclusive confidence accorded to the experimental method and to the results of the positive sciences. It thus tends to materialism. (3) Atheism becomes always more social in its manifestations. It is not merely an individual and theoretical doctrine, but above all a life. It is the social dissolvent, logically ending in anarchy. (4) Atheism is a religion. II. The blame for the increasing invasion of atheism rests upon: (1) Ecclesiasticism. The resistance of the Roman church to the progress of liberty, science, and democracy has caused the series of revolutions from protestantism to contemporary social atheism. With the fall of infallible authority has been connected the fall of religion itself. (2) The directing classes who have failed in their great task, the moral education of the people. (3) The Christian life of our epoch, our actual Christianity. Individually Christians, we are socially atheists. III. The true demonstration of the gospel is in men, in example. To those "without God" it is necessary to oppose men of God, the Man-God, the spirit of God. All that is spiritual is social. Social Christianity must be opposed to social atheism.—ELIE GOUNELLE, *Revue du Christianisme Social*, November 1896. Fr.

The Relations of Biology, Psychology, and Sociology.—The Science of Society has for its chief datum the Science of Mind. "Along with mental evolution in men, there goes higher social evolution." In order to follow out evolution under the higher forms which society presents, the special psychology of man, the social unit, must be understood, as "it is manifest that the ability of men to coöperate in

any degree as members of a society, presupposes certain intellectual faculties and certain emotions." To study social evolution the psychic faculties brought into play by social life and the influence of social life upon these faculties must be studied. The science of mind is dependent upon the science of life. For the laws of mind can only be known in connection with living bodies. Hence the relation of sociology to biology through psychology. The analogy between society and the animal consists merely in the fact that "in proportion to the multiplication of unlike parts, severally taking unlike functions, there is an increasing mutual dependence and a consequent individuation (integration) of the whole organism, animal or social," the mutual dependence of parts being that which constitutes the aggregate an organism. The analogy between animal and social structures is not to be used as the basis for sociological interpretation. Biology and sociology are reciprocal, yielding mutual elucidations. The latter can no more be founded on the former than the former on the latter. When contemplating the social aggregate simply as a mass of living units, and concerned only with increases or decreases of the units in number, and organic modifications of their natures—for interpretation of social phenomena in this group—we depend directly upon biology. When, on the other hand, we are concerned only with the development of this social aggregate into an organization of mutually dependent parts performing different duties, we depend directly upon psychology for interpretation.—HERBERT SPENCER, *Appleton's Popular Science Monthly*, December 1896. Fr.

Report on the Testimony of Past Residents in College Settlements.—

[This report is based upon forty-two answers to a long list of questions sent to settlement residents of three months' or more experience. Only a few of "the questions" and "the answers" can be given here, and then in such a way that the wide diversity of opinion cannot be shown.]

1. "What order of settlement work do you consider most valuable: personal, social and unorganized work, club work, educational work, or civil work?"

"Twenty-two place the personal work first, eight believe in all forms as equally valuable, four plead for emphasis on clubs, three on civil work, five on educational."

2. "In your opinion, is the amount of work done commensurate with the energy expended?"

"Here twenty-three enthusiastic and emphatic 'ayes' are offset by nine reluctant 'noes,' three or four well-balanced uncertainties, and one vigorous and aggrieved negative."

3. "Do you feel encouraged or the reverse with regard to the possibility of doing away with class distinctions?"

"Most of the answers are despondent; twenty grow less sanguine as time goes on, while ten are doubtfully hopeful. Settlement life is a great destroyer of theories, and the belief in the speedy disappearance of caste is usually possessed by the theorist alone."

4. "Do you think it possible for working people to attain hygienic living under present tenement-house conditions?"

"Unanimously 'no,' though one or two say 'they might do better than they do.'"

5. "Do you consider that the more general practice of thrift would materially affect the welfare of the working classes?"

"Varying and lively answers. The ayes have it by twenty-two to eighteen."

6. "What does your observation lead you to consider as the usual cause of distress among the poor? Intemperance, shiftlessness, incompetence, or conditions over which they have no control?"

"Seventeen trace poverty back to the original causes over which the poor have no control, twelve accent present incompetence however caused, four shiftlessness, seven incompetence. One only gives intemperance as primary cause."

7. "Are you on the whole satisfied with the conditions of the wage-earning population which is not suffering acute distress?"

"Very quietly, very positively, very unanimously, no. There is only one affirmative."

8. "What reforms or changes have you come to feel are (a) most urgent, (b) most practicable; (c) where would you begin?"

"First and universal comes improved housing of the poor; in quick succession follow the organization of labor, the eight-hour movement, play grounds and parks, improved schools and school laws, municipal reforms, persuasion of the poor to have smaller families, trade schools, public baths, the introduction of poetry into the lives of the poor, income tax, coffee houses, cooking and sewing obligatory in public schools, regeneration of the upper classes, consumers' league, the inculcation of thrift, free silver, municipalization of railways, lighting, etc.; temperance reform, very low in the list; sweat-shop regulations, and, finally,—mentioned by one writer only—direct religious work."—*Publications of the Church Social Union*, September 15, 1896. M.

The Concentration of Wealth.—In this article the author shows the distribution of wealth in Great Britain by the following statistics. They are based upon the returns given under the inheritance tax law for five years, beginning with 1890.

Class	Average wealth	Number	Population percentage	Aggregate wealth	Wealth percentage
1. No property	459,694	56.723
2. Under \$500.	\$279.50	93,369	11.521	\$26,090,000	617
3. Under \$1,500.	964.00	91,175	11.250	87,900,000	2.077
4. \$1,500 to \$5,000 ..	2,461.00	87,936	10.852	216,400,000	5.113
5. \$5,000 to \$50,000 ..	16,251.50	64,307	7.935	1,045,070,000	24.693
6. \$50,000, \$1,250,000.	167,433.50	13,706	1.691	2,294,845,000	54.223
7. Over \$1,250,000....	2,475,727.00	227	.028	561,990,000	13.277
Totals and averages	\$5,222.50	810,414	100.000	\$4,232,295.000	100.000

To quote: "Over 56 per cent. own nothing; and if we add the first three classes together we have nearly 80 per cent. owning less than 3 per cent., and then a little over 20 per cent. owning over 97 per cent.; if we add the first four classes together, we have over 90 per cent. of the people owning less than 8 per cent. of the wealth of the country, and under 10 per cent. owning 92 per cent.; and if we take the last two classes, we find that less than one-fiftieth of the people own over two-thirds of the wealth; and then look at that last class of millionaires, numbering less than three one-hundredths of 1 per cent., and yet owning over 13 per cent. of the wealth!"

The statistics for Massachusetts (taken from the Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor Statistics) show that from 1879 to 1881, .08 of 1 per cent. of those who died during that period owned 24.17 per cent. of the wealth involved in the estates; .50 of 1 per cent., 26.48; 1.74 per cent., 21.33; 6.80 per cent., 18.73; 12.76 per cent., 8.21; 9.12 per cent., 1.08; and that the remaining 69 per cent. owned nothing at all. Comparing these figures with those of 1829 to 1831 and 1859 to 1861, we find that the very poor are increasing in number, while their small possessions are growing smaller; that the very rich are increasing in number, and that their wealth is increasing still faster; and that the middle class is decreasing in number and decreasing still faster in its aggregate wealth.—ELTWEED POMEROY, in *Arena*, December 1896. M.

Postal Savings Banks.—Faith in the absolute solvency of the general government has created a demand for a postal savings department. Since there is about \$700,000,000 hoarded, its deposit and circulation would be of general advantage. Within two years at least \$1,000,000,000 would be deposited, enabling the government to bring the national debt within the control of citizens. Government would be made more stable by the number of citizens who would make deposits in its own banks. Postal savings banks have been introduced in all the leading countries except the United States, Germany, and Switzerland, and in Germany there are many municipal savings banks.

The proposition to establish postal savings banks in *Great Britain* was first introduced into Parliament in 1807, but the measure was not passed until 1861, when Gladstone carried it through Parliament. At the end of the first year, 2535 persons had deposited nearly £2,000,000. There are now 11,000 offices. One out of every seven persons in England is a depositor. The total amount due depositors Dec. 31, 1893, was £80,597,641. The interest for that year was £1,860,104. Before 1894 deposits were limited to £30 per year; since then £50 may be deposited. Investments may be made in government stock equal to the amount deposited. No interest is allowed on deposits exceeding £200, and the accumulations, after that amount is reached, are invested in government stock. Annuities of not less than £1 nor more than £100 may be purchased on the life of any person over five years of age. Postal banks were introduced into *Canada* in 1868. The system is similar to the English. June 30, 1896, there were 755 postal banks, 126,442 accounts remaining open, \$29,932,929 standing to credit of open accounts, \$944,524 allowed in interest for the year. *Austria* introduced the system in 1868. Interest is paid at 3 per cent. on one gulden and upwards. Bonds are bought for depositors at market price. A clearing and check system has been established. In 1895, 1,917,784 deposits were made, aggregating 37,160,508 gulden. *France* introduced the system in 1881. There are 7000 offices in France and Algiers. Three per cent. interest is paid. Sept. 1, 1894, there were 2,224,813 depositors, of whom more than two-thirds held less than 200 francs each. The amount due depositors Dec. 31, 1893, was 610,793,920 francs. *Belgium* established postal banks in 1865. In 1886 the maximum sum upon which interest was paid was reduced from 12,000 to 5000 francs, and further reduced to 3000 francs in 1891, with interest at 3 per cent. *Sweden* established banks in 1883. Coupon receipts are there given for deposits. There are 369,000 depositors, and the bank controls an invested capital of 28,000,000 crowns. *Russia* adopted the system in 1889, *Holland* in 1886, and *Italy* in 1875. The *English Colonies* have systems modeled after that of the mother country. In New Zealand the deposits number 202,276 and amount to £2,386,089. *Hawaii* introduced the system in 1886. Seventeen different bills have been introduced in the United States Congress. The Postmaster-general first recommended the establishment of the banks in 1871.—EDWARD T. HEYN, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November 1896. F.

The Brewing of the Storm.—The rise of *Altgeld* denotes the introduction into American politics of the European spirit of revolution, of which socialism is the extreme and anarchism the delirious manifestation. American institutions were framed for a community of freehold farmers and small merchants of English blood. They are now being applied to a community embracing a body of great capitalists and employers on one side and masses of wage-earners on the other, and containing a large element imbued with the social acrimony of its class in Europe. The difficulty of amendment is such as to amount to immobility. Populism, which has its source in agricultural distress, is not the greatest menace, for the farmer has property and would not march far with the socialist or anarchist of Chicago. That everyone should be free to get as much as he could for himself, was the principle of American communities. But it does not work, now that there is a proletariat. The labor of the factory is mechanical and monotonous; whereas the hand-loom weaver might have a joy in his completed work, the factory hand has no interest except his wages. The system of education begets a general desire to rise in life. When there is no hope for these aspirations, education breeds discontent. Monstrous fortunes have stimulated envy. Religion no longer reconciles men to the order of society as a divine decree. The laborer will not be put off with compensation in another world. The revolutionary spirit has spread to the family, on which the state has hitherto been founded. At a critical moment, unfortunately, came the judgment of the supreme court against the income tax. The court probably only declared the law, but the decision in favor of the Legal Tender Act condemned it as a partisan body. Experience has shown that the pretense of fostering infant industries by protection is a snare. The degradation of the senate was the natural outcome of a fiscal policy which taught the trader to look to his influence with congress rather than to the marketable value of his goods. That

the state can create prosperity by legislation, is the fallacy against which, when it appears in the guise of socialism or populism, protectionist capital fights, but upon which its own theory is in fact built. Stock-jobbing and railroad wrecking naturally arouse a spirit of revolt, and many trusts afford color for the outcry against monopoly. Wealth must justify its existence on rational grounds. Had Bryan's movement been confined to an attack of abuses, instead of assailing national credit, the insurrection might have been purifying.—GOLDWIN SMITH, *Forum*, December 1896. F.

Some Practical Lessons of the Recent Campaign.—The need of leadership and the way to secure it is one of the chief lessons. There is need of statesmanship instead of declamation in the legislature, which will devise remedies for real evils and explode imaginary ones. Workingmen are in a better position in this country than any other, but what they want is justice, even more than prosperity. The recent victory was given by states in which education is best developed and most widely diffused. Our leading colleges should be strengthened as fortresses against future outbursts of demagogism. An unenlightened democracy is a mere mob. The enlightenment of citizens is the most important of public duties.—ANDREW D. WHITE, *Forum*, December 1896. F.

The Labor Movement and Socialism in the United States.—The workman's struggle in the United States is chiefly with "the boss," not against bosses or capitalists as a class. The movement is little known except for its trades-unions and its strikes. According to the Department of Labor, in the thirteen and a half years from January, 1881, to July, 1894, strikes have affected 75,234 establishments and 4,081,096 workmen. Losses of wages have amounted to \$190,493,382, and employers' losses to \$94,825,837. Two-thirds of the cost of the industrial war have then been borne by the workmen. Thirty-two per cent. of the strikes succeeded fully, 12½ per cent. partly, 55½ per cent. failed totally. The proportion of successful strikes lessens from year to year. The fault is not with the tenacity of the workman, for the statistics show that the average duration of the strikes was increased. The proportion of failures in large establishments is much greater than in small ones. The trades-unions are nearly powerless because capital has organized, and because of the large number of unemployed. The vast system of railways is in the hands of a half-dozen men. English nobles and syndicates possess immense tracts of land. Two great trusts have lately been formed, one in coal which includes the mines and railways of six rich districts, the other in the wood trade of the Pacific coast. The Socialist party which held its ninth congress at New York in August has eight official organs in as many languages. There are also seven unofficial dailies, besides several weeklies and one monthly review. There are four other great organizations. They are the Knights of Labor, the Fabian Society, founded by Gronlund, the American Railroad Union, of which Eugene Debs is head, and the People's party, which is largely made up of farmers and farm laborers. There are, therefore, besides the unions, and the Fabian societies for study and benevolence, two great reform parties opposed to the old Democrats and Republicans, the one, the People's party, is a party of pure agitation unhappily without clear views; the other, the Socialist Labor party, is conscious of its latent force and confident of its future. The two should unite.—ADRIEN VEBER in *Revue Socialiste*, for October, 1896.

Human Welfare and the Social Question (Fourth Article).—VIII. *Development of Ownership.*—Property was at first in common. In every civilized country private ownership has grown up. This indicates that in it lies the impulse to culture. Culture is a perpetual struggle and compromise between private and general interests. Development of production is tranquil only when directing powers are stable. Private ownership brought equilibrium and the organization and concentration of power. These gave a community advantage over its neighbors. Another cause was ambition and desire for independence. The possessor of the means of production is more independent than others; complete independence is impossible in society.

IX. *Idea of Ownership.*—Rooted in community of property, ownership may be defined as that primitive right to the enjoyment of a thing which forms the basis of

all other rights to its enjoyment. This is limited by the community's right of disposal, often latent unless public interests require it. In communal ownership the property of one person is limited by the number of persons; in private ownership it is limited not by persons but by things. The tendency is toward the latter, till many persons seem shut out of the right of enjoyment of things. Reaction may result. This is the ever present, never-to-be-settled social question.

X. *Division of Property.*—There must be a compromise between general and individual good. Society exists, not of nor for itself, but for individuals. Yet it cannot consider the interests of individuals as such, but only general or at most class interests. The state has an interest in the division of property, because that state is strongest in which the lower classes are rising, and hence happy. This condition could not exist where the majority are hopelessly poor, nor where there was no difference between rich and poor. Fear of sinking and hope of rising give courage and energy to labor. These motives are most active in a society where there are infinite gradations of wealth. A gulf between classes produces hatred and hopelessness on one side, contempt and languid effort on the other. Competition makes work intense and stimulates inventiveness, foresight and economy. But its tendency toward absorption of small enterprises by large ones is dangerous to society. If this absorption should become complete, the large enterprises might not do as well as now, while they have the stimulus of competition with small enterprises, the workman's pleasure in his work would be lessened, and men become machines.

The general welfare then demands a compromise which shall preserve men's independence without great injury to production. Statistics and experience must guide the state to find this compromise. The state must decide what small industries it is judicious to protect. Probably law should depress enterprises which crowd out smaller ones, not because of cheap production but because of larger capital. The state, by taking transportation upon itself, would prevent much unnecessary competition and set many free for production. Mining and banking might be undertaken by the state. Farming should be left to the independence it has shown itself able to maintain. Art should be given back to individualism. As food, shelter, and clothing are necessary to all and affect the worker's productive power, they should be *controlled* by the state. Productiveness must be increased and be made to benefit the lower classes especially, for the safety of the state as well as for unselfish reasons.—DR. VON SCHUBERT-SOLDERN, "*Das menschliche Glück und die soziale Frage*," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, *Viertes Heft*, 1896. Fr.

New Interpretation of Sociological Phenomena.—Social life among all animals has a tendency to arrest the production of new biological and psychological types, *i. e.*, of individuals more diverse and complex. One of a herd gains in sentiments of sympathy and certain material advantages, but loses independence and the stimulus to development of intelligence that isolation in attack and defense gives. The division of labor makes the case worse for man. It has a tendency to create new types, not biological, but professional. These types being specialized are simplified, hence lower than the primitive biological type. Division of labor injures mind and body, makes a man an attachment to a machine, and causes a long list of diseases and deformities. The sentiment produced by society is unnatural and sickly. The few men who stand above the mass are content to accumulate knowledge; hence decadence and lassitude. There is evolution, but no progress. Of social groups, the one in which cohesion and division of labor are carried farthest tends to survive, hence individuals are more and more simplified, less and less original. If an inventor appears, he will be a specialist, not a universal genius. Possibly the nervousness, even insanity, often accompanying marked talent is the consequence of this unnatural one-sidedness. Social evolution does not follow a regular formula. The evolutionary formula and the dialectic formula do not necessarily contradict each other. Neither is sufficient. If society were a perfect organism or brain, the individual would be only a cell which must passively submit to evolution. But the individual can try to adapt society to his needs. In fact society has tendencies, but only tendencies, to organic development. Social evolution has made thought more logical, less intuitive. But the greatest conquests of the human mind, *i. e.*, language-making, mythologies,

fire, the lever, pottery, weaving, were the work of the primitive mind. The poet preserves somewhat the primitive mind. What increases with civilization is the passive assimilating power of thought; what lessens is the spontaneous, original and intuitive power. Hence society is unfavorable to genius. This explains why genius has shown itself oftenest when social evolution was disturbed, in crises or periods of decadence. Social evolution tends to suppress genius, to perpetuate the anthropological refuse of humanity. Statistics show that men's craniums grow smaller with every age. Their aptitudes are ever narrowing. The only remedy is artificial selection and to make social forms so elastic as not to repress individuality.—*Léon Winarski*, in *Revue Socialiste*, September and October, 1896. Fr.

Free Employment Agencies in France.—Municipal bureaux: Employment asked by 2944 persons; places secured for 1660. Labor bureaux: Employment asked by 2097 persons; places secured for 854. For months of August and September.—*Bulletin de L'Office du Travail*, October 1896. F.

Strikes in France.—For the first three quarters of the years, there have been in 1893, 558 strikes involving 157,973 persons; in 1894, 318 strikes involving 39,498; in 1895, 330 strikes involving 39,381; in 1896, 400 strikes involving about 44,000.—*Bulletin de L'Office du Travail*, October 1896. F.

State of Employment in Great Britain.—On the whole the labor market has an upward tendency. Of 111 trade unions, with an aggregate membership of 437,371, making returns, 14,582 (or 3.3 per cent.) are reported as out of employment at the end of October, compared with 3.6 per cent. in September, and with 4.9 per cent. in the 88 unions, with a membership of 395,991, from which returns were received for October 1895.—*The Labour Gazette*, November 1896. F.

Mutual Benefit Societies in Belgium.—1891, societies reporting, 398; members, 55,499; receipts, 763,899 fr.; benefits and expenses, 740,699 fr. 1892, societies reporting, 459; members, 60,995; receipts, 825,002 fr.; benefits and expenses 831,418 fr. 1893, societies reporting, 528; members, 76,095; receipts, 909,426 fr.; disbursements, 896,761 fr. 1894, societies reporting, 553; members, 77,840; receipts 962,143 fr.; disbursements, 914,069 fr. 1895, societies reporting, 699; members 90,045; receipts, 1,172,911 fr.; disbursements, 1,098,191 fr.—*Revue du Travail*, October 1896. F.

Strikes and Lockouts in Great Britain in 1895.—There was a diminution of labor disputes compared with previous years. In all there were 876 disputes resulting in stoppage of work, involving 263,758 laborers, against 1061 disputes and 324,245 laborers in 1894. The aggregate number of days estimated to have been lost during 1895 was 5,542,652, compared with 9,322,096 during 1894, and 31,205,062 during 1893. 4.2 per cent. of the disputes embraced 60.9 per cent. of the persons involved, and the six principal disputes furnished 53.4 per cent. of the aggregate number of days lost. The largest number of disputes, 197, was furnished by the building trades; but they embraced only one twenty-sixth of the persons involved. The boot and shoe dispute involved about 46,000 persons. 24 per cent. of all persons affected were successful, compared with 22 per cent. in the preceding year. 47 per cent. were partially successful. Only 28 per cent. were entirely unsuccessful, compared with 42 per cent. in the year before. 66 per cent. of the persons involved struck in support of their demands for advanced wages, as compared with 49 per cent. in 1894.—*The Labour Gazette*, November 1896. F.

Female Municipal and Provincial Suffrage.—In 1892, the resolution in the English House of Commons to give women the right to vote at legislative elections was defeated by a vote of only 175 to 152. A similar measure carried in New Zealand and in two of the United States. The movement is general. The general government of a state is occupied with general interests and is invested with public power. The provincial government is occupied with particular and private interests—chiefly the administration of funds for local purposes. With this distinction recog-

nized, it would be easy to hold that women should be excluded from participation in the general government, but permitted to participate in local elections. The right to elect members of parliament is a civil right; the right to elect members of a municipal council is a "*droit de contribuable*." A great part of local taxation is levied upon persons who have no voice in its expenditure. Woman would be a conservative element, especially if excluded from political ambitions. England, Ireland, Scotland, Russia, Prussia and Lower Austria grant women the right to participate in local government.—GABRIEL ALIX, "L'Electorat municipal et provincial des Femmes," *La Reforme Sociale*, November 1, 1896. F.

The Ethics of Socialism.—Socialism is an economic reform, but as everything else, it has its ethical basis and teaching. What is this ethical basis and what are its ethical teachings?

It is based upon collectivist ethics. It holds that the individual is the product of society and can only realize himself in society, and, therefore, that he owes everything to society. This is a good doctrine. It is also a conception of wonderful working force. We see its influence in the greater use of government for the good of all. One of the best examples of this is our factory acts.

As taught upon the street, in its popular form, its ethics is to be criticised. First, it insists "upon the enjoyments of life as an end to be sought after," and this "leads to a sort of deification of material comforts and satisfactions." The movement is too materialistic. Then "the biological conception of environment has so captured the average socialist that every moral fault in man is laid at the door of society, and the responsibility of the individual is in effect denied." Thirdly, the socialists criticise, to some extent justly, the Christian religion for teaching us to look for happiness in the next world instead of making the most of this. And, lastly, "no conception of sin enters into the ethics of socialism. Man, we are assured, would be quite right if only society would let him." These are only mischievous half truths.

In its practical platform socialism stands for the weak and the oppressed as against the strong and class interests. But in many points, especially in the case of the family, its influence is of a doubtful character.—REV. CANON E. L. HICKS, in *Economic Review*, October 1896.

Social Classes in the Republic.—The reason we have social classes, meaning by this groups who are not on an equality, and who do not meet as equals, is, that with machinery entering into production and the growth of intelligence, the working-man has become discontented and believes "that in the distribution of the earth's products and the products of industry, the laborer has been cheated of his share by the employer or capitalist." Is this condition of discontent and "class hatred" remediable? There is no conceivable system of distribution which will suit all and thus do away with discontent. Something may be done, however, by ceasing to preach the mischievous doctrine that capitalists and the higher classes are made by special favor, and preaching that "our success in this world depends on character, as we all see every day of our lives," by preaching the fact that "the man who succeeds, succeeds for the most part through character." But "discontent we cannot cure. It is part of the lot of men. Combined with great human virtues, it has done wonders for the race; but linked with social hatred, with love of dreams and delusions, it can work, and has worked, great mischief."—E. L. GODKIN, in *Atlantic Monthly*, December 1896.

The Social Philosophy of Charity Organization.—Organized charity seeks to put the charitable spirit into the form by bringing the giver and recipient into personal contact. In doing this, in stamping out pernicious forms of almsgiving, in directing and economizing "relief," it is performing a great and valuable service. But it also has a social philosophy based upon half truths and full of inconsistencies, which has a bad influence. It condemns "doles" because they come to the recipient unearned, and so weaken his feeling of "individual responsibility." It is inconsistent in not seeing that gifts and bequests, "economic rents," and other "unearned increments" coming to the rich, have the same influence. It calls unearned riches good when put to a good use, and never looks far enough to see that in their accumulation

they have entailed poverty — poverty which they cannot remedy now. This social philosophy legitimatizes such things. It further assumes that the individual is responsible for himself and his family without noticing whether or not he is capable. Or rather it assumes that every man can rise to any point. That the whole thing is a question of moral character. It does not recognize the fact that not all can be first, neither does it see that moral character is dependent upon economic and social conditions. It does not see this and consequently reverses the progressive movement. Character is first with charity workers, while *environment* must be first in point of time. In preaching this doctrine they have hindered all economic and social reform.—J. A. HOBSON in *Contemporary Review*, November 1896.

Feeble-mindedness as an Inheritance.—A study of feeble-mindedness was made in 248 families containing 887 members. In 101 of these families containing 447 persons, feeble-mindedness was found in more than the one generation. In the remaining 147 families containing 440 persons, it was found in the one, the present, generation only. Of the 447 persons, 359 or 80 per cent. were feeble-minded. Of the 440 persons, 203 or 46.1 per cent. were found so. So far as we are justified in drawing any conclusions from this, we must draw the conclusion that feeble-mindedness is inherited and that much of it is due to inheritance. Abnormalities, such as blindness, deaf-mutism, etc., were found to be several times as frequent in these 248 families as in the general population. Of the 887 persons, 186 were found to have been of illegitimate birth. So by permitting the feeble-minded to reproduce, we are not only increasing their number, but we are also increasing the number of abnormals and illegitimates. There are now 95,000 feeble-minded in the United States, of which only 6000 are in institutions for their special care. Something can and must be done to stop the reproduction of this class. And when this is done, we believe those remaining will be relatively few.—ERNEST BICKNELL in the *National Bulletin of Charities and Correction*, November 1896.

Recent Economic and Social Legislation in the United States.—In recent years a wave of conservatism has passed over state legislatures. The only exception is in regard to economic and social legislation, particularly that in the interest of the laboring class. So far as the national legislature has departed from the *laissez faire* policy, it has done so in the interest of morality, of order, or of the laboring class. Throughout the South and West there is a tendency on the part of the courts to apply constitutional checks to extreme legislation. In New England alone, where there has been no disorder or extreme legislation, have the courts been slow in applying constitutional checks. Now nearly all labor legislation is in danger of falling under constitutional prohibitions. Nearly half of such legislation in the last ten years has been questioned by the courts. Except in the recent campaign, no court has been attacked for such decisions. The principle which such legislation contravenes is that of freedom of contract. This principle has no constitutional warrant, and is not recognized in England except as a general policy to influence legislators. The past year contains few examples of concrete social legislation, partly because the popular mind is in a spirit of reaction owing to the economic depression and the riots of 1893-4, and partly because most of the legislatures did not meet. Only fourteen legislatures had regular sessions. Their social legislation has mainly been limited to laws concerning fortnightly payment of wages, hours of labor in certain occupations, priority of legal claims given to laborers as against their debtors, etc. In 1889-90, of 1192 important statutes, 17 reasserted individualistic principles, 342 embodied socialistic principles, 832 dealt with general law matters; the percentage of socialistic legislation being greatest in the states around Kansas and Nebraska.—F. J. STIMSON, *Yale Review*, November 1896.

F.

Recent Legislation in England.—The conciliation act was passed providing that any board of conciliation may apply to the Board of Trade for registration. The Board of Trade is authorized to take steps to bring parties together where they do not seem to be coming to an agreement, or even where a difficulty is threatened. Conciliation boards may be established for given districts or trades. The Board of Trade is

empowered to defray the cost of its proceedings and make reports to Parliament. Thus any strike or dispute may come before Parliament, whereas that body has heretofore taken cognizance only of those on railways and steamships holding mail contracts or receiving subsidies from the admiralty. A new Truck Act was passed defining explicitly the contracts under which fines could be exacted of workmen by employers. Retail stores are grouped with factories. Fines must be fair and reasonable, or they may be recovered by legal proceedings. It was found in the investigation that the relative amount of fines was infinitesimal, but that they were of essential value in maintaining discipline as an alternative to dismissal. The new Mines Regulation Act is intended solely to set up new rules for the personal protection of laborers. The Agricultural Rates Act is to be in operation for five years. Under it, farm hands are to pay only one-half what they have hitherto paid to local taxation. The Light Railways Act provides for the encouragement of railway communication with great tracts of country still remote from existing lines. Regular railways can be built only by special charter and must meet certain requirements as to road and equipment. Light railways may be authorized by a commission, where they are proved to be necessary, and may be more cheaply built. The treasury may also make an advance of one-quarter the amount needed for construction.—EDWARD PORRITT, *Yale Review*, November 1896. F.

Ethics from the Point of View of Sociology (continued).—B. Ethics before Kant. (a) Character of Greek ethics. The fundamental trait of Greek life was individualism. It found itself the sufficient principle and final end of active life and speculation. The people in their theory reflected the equilibrium which they realized between social and individual life, but were not able to fix the principle they found. (b) Christian ethics. The value of man as man, which was lacking in ancient Greece, is the basis of the new ideas which bring about a social revolution. But a break with nature, the source of corruption, was introduced. The first effort to eliminate this dualism was marked by an apparent return to the past, by the resurrection of ancient naturalism of the epoch of the Renaissance. (c) Immediate antecedents of the Kantian ethics; social changes were closely connected with the transformation of ethical ideas. The most characteristic idea of this transformation was that of separation of theory and practice, found in Locke and the English moralists of the eighteenth century, in a measure in Leibnitz, in Diderot and Rousseau, but not explicitly until Kant. This dualism was not unconscious, as in Socrates, where it resulted from traditionalism in morals; nor as in early Christianity, where it was caused by the identification of morals and religion. It was the first effort to humanize the moral problem. C. The French Revolution and Kantian ethics. (a) Individualistic interpretation of the revolutionary movement and the ethics of Kant. (1) The Revolution proclaimed the rights of man—the inviolable will of the individual. (2) Kant's ethics founds its law upon a reciprocity of the action of free wills. The will is an end in itself, a principle of universal legislation. Morality is reduced to intention. (b) The struggle against individualism in the Revolution and in Kant's ethics. (1) On one side the Revolution was purely negative. It was a struggle to dissolve the bonds of traditional solidarity. But its point of departure was a reciprocity of rights, *i. e.*, it affirmed a solidarity based upon nature and common human aspirations. (2) The work of Kant was also destructive. He attacked speculative dogmatism. But no ethics could be founded upon such a negative work. (b) The deficiency in the revolutionary idea and the thought of Kant. Both were absorbed in the strife against institutions and doctrines of the time. Conclusion. Primitive ethics was constant in relation to social life, but was unconscious. Greek ethics was insufficient, because it isolated the individual, and by its opposition to traditional morality prevented a readjustment to the new social conditions. The triumph of subjectivism takes place in Kant. This leads to the disappearance of exclusive individualism and the reconciliation of society and the individual. Immediately after the Revolution and Kant, the idea of solidarity arose. In this sense, the ethics of Kant is antecedent to sociology. We are now in an epoch of transition. A remedy for its evils should be found in the search for the advent of a new organic period.—MARCEL BERNÈS, "Programme d'un cours de sociologie générale: la morale au point de vu sociologique (*fin*)," *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, November 1896. F.